

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this Application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed on November 16, 2005. Claims 1-15 are pending in the Application, Claims 1-4 stand rejected, and Claims 5-13 have not been further considered because of improper multiple dependency. Claims 1-13 are amended and new Claims 14 and 15 added the present Amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Specification and abstract of the disclosure were objected to because of informalities; Claims 5-13 were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) for being in improper multiple dependent form; Claims 1-4 were objected to for minor spelling informalities; Claims 1-2, 4/1, and 4/2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by Heyward (U.S. Patent No. 6,354,797); and Claims 1-3, 4/1, 4/2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) as being anticipated by Dierberger (U.S. Patent No. 4,040,676).

Applicants thank Examiner Christopher Verdier for the courtesy of an interview extended to Applicants' representative on April 14, 2005. During the interview, amendments to the claims as herein presented were proposed, and arguments as hereinafter developed were presented. During the interview, Applicants' representative explained that the fillet cooling passages of Heyward and Dierberger do not extend in a longitudinal direction along the outer circumference of the airfoil, as now recited in Claim 1.

An agreement with respect to the claims was reached during the personal interview. As noted by Examiner Verdier on the interview summary (form PTOL-413), "Applicants' representative proposed amending Claim 1 to recite that the fillet extends with its longitudinal direction along the outer circumference of the airfoil, wit the fillet extending in the longitudinal direction of the fillet for a part of the length of the fillet. The Examiner

agreed that this amendment would define over Dierberger and Heyward. Applicants will amend the specification to incorporate the above claim language.”

Claim 1 is amended to recite that the fillet extends in a longitudinal direction along the outer circumference of the air foil. Based at least on the foregoing discussion and the results of the personal interview, Applicants respectfully submit that the above-summarized rejections are now moot. Their withdrawal is respectfully requested.

As to the objection of the Specification and abstract of the Disclosure, Applicants note with appreciation the time taken by the Examiner to identify specific areas needing revisions. Applicants have submitted herein a substitute Specification and respectfully request reconsideration of the same. As required, Applicants are submitting both a substitute Specification in clean form and another version of the substitute Specification marked up to show all changes relative to the previous version. Applicants have also herein submitted a revised abstract to comply with that objection and respectfully request reconsideration of the same. Applicants state that the corrections made to the substitute Specification and abstract do not add any new matter to this application and have been implemented only to improve the reading of Applicants’ disclosure.

Finally, Applicants have submitted new Claims 14 and 15, which find non-limiting support on the originally filed Claim 1. Therefore, new Claims 14 and 15 are not believed to raise a question of new matter.¹ Because Claims 14 and 15 incorporate by reference all of the features of Claim 1, in view of the above-presented remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that new Claims 14 and 15 should be allowed over Dierberger and Heyward.

¹ See MPEP 2163.06 stating that "information contained in any one of the specification, claims or drawings of the application as filed may be added to any other part of the application without introducing new matter."

Application No. 10/724,091
Reply to Office Action of November 16, 2005

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-15 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

GJM/RTP/MQM/kkn
I:\ATTY\MQM\24'S\245941US\AM 4-16-05.DOC

Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Robert T. Pous
Registration No. 29,099
Attorneys of Record